



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/040,499	12/28/2001	David J. Long	50277-1768	3702

29989 7590 03/28/2005

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP
2055 GATEWAY PLACE
SUITE 550
SAN JOSE, CA 95110

EXAMINER

PHAM, CHRYSTINE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2192

DATE MAILED: 03/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/040,499

Applicant(s)

LONG ET AL.

Examiner

Chrystine Pham

Art Unit

2122

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-74 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-74 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>02/28/05, 10/07/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to application 10/040499 filed on December 28th 2001. Claims 1-74 are presented for examination. Priority date of May 12th 2000 has been considered.

Specification

2. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.
4. Claims 1-3, 6-16, 22-25, 28-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 1

Claimed as "a method of specifying properties for instances that belong to classes, comprising the step of associating with an instance of a class a per-instance method that is not a method in said class", it is merely a manipulation of abstract ideas or concepts (i.e., something that can be done by a person as mental step or using pencil and paper) which cannot exhibit any functional interrelationship with the way in which computing processes are performed by the computer to produce a concrete, useful, and tangible result. Such claim constitutes nonfunctional descriptive material, and such descriptive material is not a statutory process (i.e., method). *Schrader*, 22 F.3d at 294-95, 30 USPQ2d at 1458-59. *Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759).

Claims 2-3, 6-16

Claims recite limitations which are merely a manipulation of abstract ideas or concepts. Such claims constitute nonfunctional descriptive material, and such descriptive material is not a statutory process (i.e., method). Schrader, 22 F.3d at 294-95, 30 USPQ2d at 1458-59. Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759).

Claim 22

Claimed as "a method of specifying properties for instances that belong to classes, comprising the step of associating with a first instance of a class a per-instance method that is not associated with a second instance of said class", it is merely a manipulation of abstract ideas or concepts (i.e., something that can be done by a person as mental step or using pencil and paper) which cannot exhibit any functional interrelationship with the way in which computing processes are performed by the computer to produce a concrete, useful, and tangible result. Such claim constitutes nonfunctional descriptive material, and such descriptive material is not a statutory process (i.e., method). Schrader, 22 F.3d at 294-95, 30 USPQ2d at 1458-59. Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759).

Claims 22-25, 28-37

Claims recite limitations which are merely a manipulation of abstract ideas or concepts. Such claims constitute nonfunctional descriptive material, and such descriptive material is not a statutory process (i.e., method). Schrader, 22 F.3d at 294-95, 30 USPQ2d at 1458-59. Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claim 58 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 58 recites the limitation "implementation of said method" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For compact prosecution of the claims, the examiner interprets limitation "implementation", hereinafter, to refer to "an implementation" recited line claim 54, line 10.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 1-3, 6-11, 17, 19-22, 24, 25, 28-33, 38, 39, 41, 44-49, 54, 56-59, 61, 62, 65-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Guillen et al. (US 5701485), hereinafter, *Guillen et al.*.

Claim 1

Guillen et al. teach a method of specifying properties for instances that belong to classes (e.g., see FIG.1 & associated text; see _FIG.3 & associated text), comprising the step of:

- o associating with an instance (e.g., see *Object B2 18* FIG.1 & associated text) of a class (e.g., see *Class B 14* FIG.1 & associated text) a per-instance method that is not a method in said class (e.g., see *Method W 42, 22, 41* FIG.1 & associated text).

Claim 2

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. *Guillen et al.* further teach wherein the step of associating a per-instance method includes:

- o associating a policy (e.g., see *prioritization scheme* col.2:15-50) with a method implementation for a particular method (e.g., see *instance-specific dispatch tables, additional methods, new methods* col.2:15-50); and
- o associating said policy with said instance (e.g., see *dispatch table of object instance* col.2:15-50).

Claim 3

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. *Guillen et al.* further teach wherein said step of associating is performed by establishing a policy bundle that includes one or more policies and associating said instance with said policy bundle (e.g., see *prioritization scheme, method, methods* col.2:15-50; see 20, 22 FIG.1 & associated text).

Claim 6

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. *Guillen et al.* further teach wherein said step of associating includes establishing a pointer (i.e., reference) that belongs to said instance to point to (i.e., references) a policy bundle that is associated with one or more policies (e.g., see *Object B2 18, 51, 22* FIG.1 & associated text).

Claim 7

The method for Claim 6 wherein associating said policy bundle with said one or more policies includes establishing a pointer (i.e., reference) that belongs to said policy bundle to point to (i.e., to reference) said one or more policies (e.g., see 22, 40, 41 FIG.1 & associated text).

Claim 8

The rejection of base claim 6 is incorporated. Claim recites limitations, which have been addressed in claim 7, therefore, is rejected for the same reasons as cited in claim 7.

Claim 9

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. Claim recites limitations, which have been addressed in claim 6, therefore, is rejected for the same reasons as cited in claim 6.

Claims 10, 11

The rejection of base claim 9 is incorporated. Claims recite limitations, which have been addressed in claim 7, therefore, are rejected for the same reasons as cited in claim 7.

Claim 17

Guillen et al. teach a method of executing a method implementation (e.g., see *objects, methods, execute[d]* col.1:28-43; see *method, executed* col.5:5), comprising the computer-implemented steps of:

- in response to detecting use of a particular method with a particular instance of a class (e.g., see *method, target object instance* col.2:15-50), performing the steps of:
- determining the implementation of said method to execute by determining whether any implementation of said method has been associated with said particular instance (e.g., see *method, target object instance* col.2:15-50); and
- if an implementation of said method has been associated with said particular instance,

then executing the implementation of the method that has been associated with said particular instance (e.g., see *Object B2 18, Method W 42* FIG.1 & associated text; see *objects, methods, execute[d]* col.1:28-43; see *method, executed* col.5:5).

Claim 19

The rejection of base claim 17 is incorporated. *Guillen et al.* further teach further comprising the computer-implemented steps of:

- if no implementation of said method is associated with said particular instance (e.g., see *target object instance, method* col.2:29-34; col.3:24-26), then performing the steps of
- determining whether any implementation of said method has been associated with any class in a line of inheritance of said particular instance (e.g., see *inherited dispatch tables* col.2:15-50; see *chained referencing* col.2:15-50; see *search routine* col.3:20-30);
- if an implementation of said method has been associated with a class in a line of inheritance of said particular instance, then executing the implementation of the method that has been associated with the class (e.g., see *Method X 12a, 30, 52 FIG.1* & associated text; see *method X, object 18* col.4:48-col.55; see *method, executed* col.5:5; see *objects, methods, execute[d]* col.1:28-43).

Claim 20

The rejection of base claim 19 is incorporated. *Guillen et al.* further teach wherein said implementation of said method that has been associated with said particular instance is a first implementation of said method (e.g., see *lower level method Y, class 14* col.4:24-47) and a second implementation of said method is associated with said line of inheritance (e.g., see *higher level method Y, superclass 12* col.4:24-47); and the step of executing is performed by executing the first implementation and not the second implementation (e.g., see *method Y, class 14, superclass 12* col.4:24-67; see *objects, methods, execute[d]* col.1:28-43; see *method, executed* col.5:5).

Claim 21

The rejection of base claim 19 is incorporated. *Guillen et al.* further teach further comprising the computer-implemented step of, if no implementation of said method has been associated with any class in a line of inheritance of said particular instance, then executing a default method implementation (e.g., see *Object B1 16, Object B2 18, method W 42, W 41 FIG.1* & associated text; see *objects, methods, execute[d]* col.1:28-43; see *method, executed* col.5:5).

Claim 22

Guillen et al. teach a method of specifying properties for instances that belong to classes (e.g., see FIG.1 & associated text), comprising the step of :

- o associating with a first instance (e.g., see *Object B2 18* FIG.1 & associated text) of a class (e.g., see *another object, same class* Abstract; see *other object instance* col.2:29-38; see *Class B 14* FIG.1 & associated text) a per-instance method (e.g., see *required method* Abstract; see *method* col.2:29-38; see *Method W 42, 41* Fig.1 & associated text) that is not associated with a second instance of said class (e.g., see *first object, same class* Abstract; see *method, target object instance* col.2:30-35; see FIG.3 & associated text; see *Object B1 16* FIG.1 & associated text).

Claims 24, 25

The rejection of base claim 22 is incorporated. Claims recite limitations, which have been addressed in claims 2, and 3 respectively, therefore, are rejected for the same reasons as cited in claims 2, and 3.

Claim 28

The rejection of base claim 22 is incorporated. Claim recites limitations, which have been addressed in claim 6, therefore, is rejected for the same reasons as cited in claim 6.

Claims 29-30

The rejection of base claim 28 is incorporated. Claims recite limitations, which have been addressed in claim 7, therefore, are rejected for the same reasons as cited in claim 7.

Claim 31

The rejection of base claim 22 is incorporated. Claim recites limitations, which have been addressed in claim 6, therefore, is rejected for the same reasons as cited in claim 6.

Claims 32-33

The rejection of base claim 31 is incorporated. Claims recite limitations, which have been addressed in claim 7, therefore, are rejected for the same reasons as cited in claim 7.

Claim 38

Guillen et al. teach a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions for specifying properties for instances that belong to classes (e.g., see 72-76 FIG.4 & associated text), wherein execution of the one or more sequences of instructions by one or more processors (e.g., see 61 FIG.2 & associated text) causes the one or more processors to perform the steps of:

- o associating with an instance (e.g., see *Object B2 18* FIG.1 & associated text) of a class (e.g., see *Class B 14* FIG.1 & associated text) a per-instance method that is not a method in said class (e.g., see *Method W 42, 22, 41* FIG.1 & associated text).

Claims 39, 41

The rejection of base claim 38 is incorporated. Claims recite limitations, which have been addressed in claims 2, and 3, respectively, therefore, are rejected for the same reasons as cited in claims 2, and 3.

Claims 44

The rejection of base claim 38 is incorporated. Claim recites limitations, which have been addressed in claim 6, therefore, is rejected for the same reasons as cited in claim 6.

Claims 45-46

The rejection of base claim 44 is incorporated. Claims recite limitations, which have been addressed in claim 7, therefore, are rejected for the same reasons as cited in claim 7.

Claim 47

The rejection of base claim 38 is incorporated. Claim recites limitations, which have been addressed in claim 6, therefore, is rejected for the same reasons as cited in claim 6.

Claims 48-49

The rejection of base claim 47 is incorporated. Claims recite limitations, which have been addressed in claim 7, therefore, are rejected for the same reasons as cited in claim 7.

Claim 54

Guillen et al. teach a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions (e.g., see 72-76 FIG.4 & associated text) for executing a method implementation (e.g., see *objects, methods, execute[d]* col.1:28-43;), wherein execution of the one or more sequences of instructions by one or more processors (e.g., see 61 FIG.2 & associated text) causes the one or more processors to perform the steps of:

- in response to detecting use of a particular method with a particular instance of a class (e.g., see *method, target object instance* col.2:15-50), performing the steps of:
- determining the implementation of said method to execute by determining whether any implementation of said method has been associated with said particular instance (e.g., see *method, target object instance* col.2:15-50); and
- if an implementation of said method has been associated with said particular instance, then executing the implementation of the method that has been associated with said particular instance (e.g., see *Object B2 18, Method W 42* FIG.1 & associated text; see *objects, methods, execute[d]* col.1:28-43; see *method, executed* col.5:5).

Claim 56

The rejection of base claim 54 is incorporated. Claim recites limitations, which have been addressed in claim 19, therefore, is rejected for the same reasons as cited in claim 19.

Claim 57

The rejection of base claim 56 is incorporated. Claim recites limitations, which have been addressed in claim 20, therefore, is rejected for the same reasons as cited in claim 20.

Claim 58

The rejection of base claim 54 is incorporated. Claim recites limitations, which have been addressed in claim 21, therefore, is rejected for the same reasons as cited in claim 21.

Claim 59

Guillen et al. teach a computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions for specifying properties for instances that belong to classes (e.g., see FIG.1 & associated text; see 72-76 FIG.4 & associated text), wherein execution of the one or more sequences of instructions by one or more processors (e.g., see 61 FIG.2 & associated text) causes the one or more processors to perform the steps of:

- o associating with a first instance (e.g., see *Object B2 18* FIG.1 & associated text) of a class (e.g., see *another object, same class* Abstract; see *other object instance* col.2:29-38; see *Class B 14* FIG.1 & associated text) a per-instance method (e.g., see *required method* Abstract; see *method* col.2:29-38; see *Method W 42, 41* Fig.1 & associated text) that is not associated with a second instance of said class (e.g., see *first object, same class* Abstract; see *method, target object instance* col.2:30-35; see FIG.3 & associated text; see *Object B1 16* FIG.1 & associated text).

Claims 61, 62

The rejection of base claim 59 is incorporated. Claims recite limitations, which have been addressed in claims 2, and 3, respectively, therefore, are rejected for the same reasons as cited in claims 2, and 3.

Claim 65

Art Unit: 2122

The rejection of base claim 59 is incorporated. Claim recites limitations, which have been addressed in claim 6, therefore, is rejected for the same reasons as cited in claim 6.

Claims 66-67

The rejection of base claim 65 is incorporated. Claims recite limitations, which have been addressed in claim 7, therefore, are rejected for the same reasons as cited in claim 7.

Claim 68

The rejection of base claim 59 is incorporated. Claim recites limitations, which have been addressed in claim 6, therefore, is rejected for the same reasons as cited in claim 6.

Claims 69-70

The rejection of base claim 68 is incorporated. Claims recite limitations, which have been addressed in claim 7, therefore, are rejected for the same reasons as cited in claim 7.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 16, 18, 23, 40, 55, and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Guillen et al.* in view of *Curtis et al.* (US 6336216), hereinafter, *Curtis et al.*.

Claim 16

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. *Guillen et al.* do not expressly disclose wherein said class is a file type and said instance is a file of said file type in a file system wherein the step of associating includes associating said file of said file type with said per-instance method that is not a method of said file type. However, *Curtis et al.* disclose

- o wherein said class is a file type and said instance is a file of said file type in a file system (e.g., see *FileInputStream* *fi* col.7:45-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of *Curtis et al.* into that of *Guillen et al.* for the inclusion of associating a file of said file type with a per-instance method that is not a method of said file type. And the motivation for doing so would have been to provide a computer controlled object-oriented programming system and method for storing and extracting plurality of data files via methods defined within class objects/instances (e.g., *Curtis et al.* col.2:20-37).

Claim 18

The rejection of base claim 17 is incorporated. *Guillen et al.* further teach

- o executing an implementation of a method associated with an instance of a class (e.g., see *Object B2 18*, *Method W 42* FIG.1 & associated text; see *objects, methods, execute[d]* col.1:28-43; see *method, executed* col.5:5). *Guillen et al.* do not expressly disclose wherein said class is a file type and said particular instance is a file of said file type in a file system. However, *Curtis et al.* disclose wherein said class is a file type and said particular instance is a file of said file type in a file system (e.g., see *FileInputStream* *fi* col.7:45-67).). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of *Curtis et al.* into that of *Guillen et al.* for the inclusion of file of a file type. And the motivation for doing so would have been that, which has been cited in claim 16.

Claims 23, 40, 60

Claims recite limitations, which have been addressed in claim 16, therefore, are rejected for the same reasons as cited in claims 16.

Claim 55

Claim recites limitations, which have been addressed in claim 18, therefore, is rejected for the same reasons as cited in claim 18.

11. Claims 4, 5, 12, 26, 27, 34, 42, 43, 50, 63, 64, and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Guillen et al.* in view of *Ng et al.* (US 6385618), hereinafter, *Ng et al.*.

Claim 4

The rejection of base claim 3 is incorporated. *Guillen et al.* do not expressly disclose storing within a database, objects that define said instance, said policy bundle, and said one or more policies. However, *Ng et al.* disclose storing within a database (e.g., see *relational database* col.1:60-col.2:25; see 118 FIG.1 & associated text), objects that define said instance, said policy bundle, and said one or more policies (e.g., see 400, 401 FIG.4A & associated text). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of *Ng et al.* into that of *Guillen et al.* for the inclusion of a database storing objects that define instances, and one or more policies. And the motivation for doing so would have been to facilitate the development of application programs that utilize a relational database by generating source code with classes that reflect the structure of the database and to enable modification to the database through source code via an object-relational mapping tool (e.g., *Ng et al.* col.1:55-60; col.2:35-40).

Claim 5

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. *Guillen et al.* do not expressly disclose maintaining an object relational mapping system that indicates a correlation between said instance and data stored in a relational database. However, *Ng et al.* disclose maintaining an object relational mapping system that

Art Unit: 2122

indicates a correlation between said instance and data stored in a relational database (e.g., see *object-relational mapping tools* col.1:60-col.2:35; see FIGS.11A, 11B, 12 & associated text; see *object-relational mapping tool* col.4:14-55; see 114 FIG.1 & associated text). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of *Ng et al.* into that of *Guillen et al.* for the inclusion of an object relational mapping system. And the motivation for doing so would have been that which has been cited in claim 4.

Claim 12

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. *Guillen et al.* do not expressly disclose wherein said step of associating includes using a hash table for a policy bundle and said policy bundle is associated with said instance. However, *Ng et al.* disclose wherein said step of associating includes using a hash table for a policy bundle and said policy bundle is associated with said instance (e.g., see 404, 412 FIG.4A & associated text). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of *Ng et al.* into that of *Guillen et al.* for the inclusion of a hash table storing data associated with class instances. And the motivation for doing so would have been to facilitate storage and fast retrieval of data via a hash function as well known in the art.

Claim 26, 42, 63

Claims recite limitations, which have been addressed in claim 4, therefore, are rejected for the same reasons as cited in claim 4.

Claims 27, 43, 64

Claims recite limitations, which have been addressed in claim 5, therefore, are rejected for the same reasons as cited in claim 5.

Claims 34, 50, 71

Claims recite limitations, which have been addressed in claim 12, therefore, are rejected for the same reasons as cited in claim 12.

12. Claims 13-15, 35-37, 51-53, 72-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Guillen et al.* in view of *Ng et al.* further in view of *Dupuy et al.* (US 6523171), hereinafter, *Dupuy et al.*.

Claim 13

The rejection of base claim 12 is incorporated. *Ng et al.* further teach wherein said step of associating includes placing an entry in said hash table (e.g., see 406, 408, 414-418 FIG.4A & associated text) and further comprising the computer-implemented steps of:

- associating a key and a value with said entry (e.g., see 406, 408, 414-418 FIG.4A & associated text; see 206, 212, 214, 216 FIG.2 & associated text);
- using an association between said policy bundle and said policy as said value (e.g., see 412, 418 FIG.4A & associated text).

Ng et al. do not expressly disclose using a method name as said key. However, *Dupuy et al.* disclose using a method name as said key (e.g., see *hash key 300*, *evalRate 322* FIG.3 & associated text). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of *Dupuy et al.* into that of *Guillen et al.* and *Ng et al.* for the inclusion of using a method name as a key. And the motivation for doing so would have been to facilitate the fast retrieval of return type, input arguments, and access type associated with the key (i.e., method name) to enable generation of object-oriented source code classes based on object and their associated methods stored in said hash table (e.g., see *Dupuy et al.* 125, 130 FIG.1 & associated text).

Claim 14

The rejection of base claim 13 is incorporated. *Ng et al.* further teach wherein said value is a pointer (i.e., reference) to said policy (e.g., see *FOREIGN KEY*, 216, 206 FIG.2 & associated text; see 418 FIG.4A & associated text).

Claim 15

The rejection of base claim 13 is incorporated. Claim recites limitations (i.e., a reference), which have been addressed in claim 14, therefore, is rejected for the same reasons as cited in claim 14.

Claims 35, 51

Claims recite limitations, which have been addressed in claim 13, therefore, are rejected for the same reasons as cited in claim 13.

Claims 36-37, 52-53, 73-74

Claims recite limitations, which have been addressed in claim 14, therefore, are rejected for the same reasons as cited in claim 14.

Claims 35, 51, 72

Claims recite limitations, which have been addressed in claim 13, therefore, are rejected for the same reasons as cited in claim 13.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chrystine Pham whose telephone number is 571-272-3702. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 8:30am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q Dam can be reached on 571-272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CP
March 17, 2005

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Tuan Dam', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER